

Remarks

The Office has maintained the rejections of Claims 1-20 as being obvious over Sperry (5995723) in view of Lamming (5862321). Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Office's detailed remarks in reply to Applicant's arguments. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the Office has incorrectly interpreted and applied the two references.

In reply to the Applicant's arguments distinguishing Lamming, the Office states:

"In response, as shown in fig. 1, both PDA 16 and host computer 21 connected in a printing network can communicate the print request to the printer. As shown in fig. 6b, document A is generated from workstation 21 and then sends to multi-functional fax machine 38, and further communicates with PDA 16. Since communication between multi-functional fax machine 38 and PDA 16 is widely known and available in the art, one of ordinary skill would modify user interface (fig. 7) of Sperry to include a selection box for wireless notification to be sent to PDA devices in addition to "Mail" and "Screen" notification method as shown in fig. 7." Office Action, page 5.

Claim 11 requires, in response to receiving a print job with wireless notification instructions, performing the print job and transferring the print job status over a wireless link to a wireless receiver that is different from the initiating device. The fact that the claimed communication may be *possible* using the hardware configuration disclosed in Lamming is not sufficient to support the rejection. The fact is that Lamming does not teach or even suggest sending print job status to a wireless receiver that is not the initiating device. Moreover, neither Sperry nor Lamming teach a wireless notification *request*. The Office has made no showing to the contrary. The combination of Sperry and Lamming, therefore, does not (indeed cannot) teach or suggest these two claim elements — receiving a wireless notification request and transferring the print job status over a wireless link to a wireless receiver that is different from the initiating device.

Claims 1 and 5 are programming counterparts to the method of Claim 1 and contain similar limitations.

[As noted in the response to the first Action, Lamming teaches a confidential printer "Picador 36b" deferring a print job until the requesting "Richard's TAB" (PDA) 16 is detected near the printer and then printing the job and alerting the PDA 16 that the

job is done. The fact that the print job is deferred until "the next time Richard is in the vicinity of Picador 36b" clearly suggests that Richard's PDA is the requesting device. So far as Applicant can determine, Lamming does not say which device actually communicates the print request to the printer. There appear to be two options – (1) the PDA communicates the print request to the document database server which has access to the document and then the document database server sends the print request to the printer or (2) the PDA sends the print request to the printer with the document token and the printer retrieves the document from the database server.


In scenario number 1, the wireless receiver (Richard's PDA) might be deemed to be different from the initiating device. Even if Lamming is construed to suggest scenario number 1, there is still no teaching that the print request from the document database server includes a wireless notification request. On the contrary, the fact that Lamming calls out a "confidential" printer in his notification scenario clearly suggests the printer is pre-programmed to defer printing until Richard's PDA shows up. In scenario number 2, of course, the wireless receiver is the same as the initiating device.

So, no matter how Lamming is construed, the two references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1, 5 and 11.]

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Luman

By



Steven R. Ormiston  
Reg. No. 35,974

October 24, 2005